DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 222 JC 860 273

AUTHOR Murphy, Brian; Lara, Olga
TITLE Community College Reform. Draft Outline.
INSTITUTION California State Legislature, Sacramento. Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education.
PUB DATE 3 Jun 86
NOTE 37p.; For a related document, see ED 269 048.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; College Faculty; College Role; *Community Colleges; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; Educational Improvement; *Educational Quality; Financial Policy; *Governance; *Long Range Planning; Master Plans; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

This report from the California State Legislature's Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education presents proposals and recommendations regarding the future of the state's community colleges. Section I introduces the major demographic, social, and economic challenges facing the California community colleges over the next two decades, and states the intention of subsequent proposals with respect to strengthening the colleges' capacities to meet the emerging needs of the state. Section II offers recommendations to ensure that students have opportunities for access and success at the community college through adequate assessment, counseling, and placement. Section III reviews the primary goals of the community college, including recommendations for strengthening transfer education, vocational education, and transitional education (i.e., remedial education, English as a second language instruction, and noncredit adult education). Section IV focuses on faculty, administrators, and staff, covering such areas as credentials, recruitment, affirmative action, the employment of part-time faculty, tenure, collective bargaining, student services staff, professional development, and the intellectual and personal environment. Section V describes the community colleges' governance system, focusing on the roles of the board of governors, the district governing boards, and campus boards. Section VI offers a critique of community college financing and recommends a differential funding system to remedy current defects. Finally, section VII offers commitee staff conclusions concerning costs and related matters. (RO)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272222

DRAFT OUTLINE

COMMUNITY COLLEGE REFORM

June 3, 1986

Joint Committee
for Review of the Master Plan
for Higher Education

Brian Murphy, Chief Consultant
Olga Lara, Associate Consultant

JC 860 273

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. VASCONCELLOS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
i.	PREFACE	i
I.	INTRODUCTION/INTENT	1
II.	ACCESS/SUCCESS	3
	Assessment, Counseling and Placement	4
III.	MISSION AND FUNCTIONS	6
	Transfer Education	8
	Vocational Education	9
	Transitional Education	11
	Remediation	11
	English as a Second Language	13
	State-funded Non-credit Adult Education	13
	Fee-Based Community Services	15
IV.	FACULTY, ADMINISTRATORS AND STAFF	15
	Credentials	16
	Recruitment and Affirmative Action	17
	Employment of Part-time Faculty	18
	Tenure	20
	Collective Bargaining	21
	Student Services Staff	21
	Professional Development	22
	Intellectual and Personal Environment	22
V.	GOVERNANCE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES	24
	Board of Governors	25
	District Governing Boards	27
	Campus Governance	27
VI.	COMMUNITY COLLEGE FINANCE	28
VII.	STAFF CONCLUSIONS CONCERNING COST AND RELATED MATTERS	31

PREFACE

Pursuant to SB 1570 (Nielsen, 1984) and SB 2064 (Stiern, 1984), the Commission for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education was created in March 1985, and charged immediately to do a reassessment study of the California Community Colleges. Following a long series of hearings, and a detailed review of testimony and staff analysis, the Commission on April 2, 1986 presented its report "The Challenge of Change" to the Legislative Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, created by ACR 162 (Hughes, 1984) and charged to review the Commission report to provide recommendations to the Legislature.

The Joint Committee subsequently held two public hearings on April 10, 1986 (Sacramento) and April 25, 1986 (Los Angeles) to receive public testimony and reaction to the proposals of the Master Plan Commission. Detailed analysis and commentary was presented by a wide cross-section of groups, organizations and persons. Thereafter, the Joint Committee staff prepared a matrix document comparing the Commission's recommendations and those of the Chancellor's and all others.

In an effort to expedite the Joint Committee's work, the Chairman formed an Executive Committee representing each of the Legislative Caucuses represented on the Committee (Chair Vasconcellos, Vice Chair Hart, Senator Nielsen, and Assemblyman Bader). The Executive Committee met on May 27, 1986, discussed the matrix, and requested the Joint Committee staff to prepare a comprehensive draft report containing proposals and recommendations regarding California's Community Colleges for the Joint Committee.

This draft was delivered to the Joint Committee's Executive Committee on June 2, 1986. The Executive Committee determined that the Draft Report was a strong and credible document which would provide the basis for discussion, comment and critique--both within the Joint Committee and with the California public. Accordingly, the Executive Committee directed staff to distribute this draft to all Committee Members and to the public, and to invite response from the public, especially to be presented/received at a Joint Committee public hearing in the near future. The Joint Committee will meet to deliberate and develop its formal report and recommendations to be presented to the Legislature.

The following Draft Report is just and simply that: a Draft Proposal. Members of the Executive Committee do not necessarily agree with all its provisions, yet find it valuable and presentable to provide an articulate and coherent beginning for discussion. It will now be debated, refined, and redrafted into a final report of the Committee. This process represents an important next step for comprehensive Community College reform, carrying the Commission's work forward to the full Legislature.

Finally, the Executive Committee understands that any potentially significant community college reform may well entail significant resources, and is concerned that the membership of the Joint Committee and all concerned parties be fully informed about potential costs. Accordingly, the Executive Committee has requested the California Postsecondary

Education Commission to conduct an assessment of the cost of the programs and proposals contained in this draft report, drawing upon the assistance, where appropriate, the Community College Chancellor's Office, the Legislative Analyst and the Department of Finance. This cost analysis will contain an analysis of the amount and sequence of costs over time of full implementation. Further, since a number of the program proposals call for the participation of the Chancellor's Office, the Committee leadership has asked CPEC to make estimates concerning the staff and resources required in that office.

So we submit this draft report to the full Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education to all concerned Californians and invite each of you to join us and work with us toward finializing our report and providing the Legislature with a plan for revitalizing California Community Colleges to meet the needs of Californians for the rest of this century.

I. INTRODUCTION/INTENT

The California Community Colleges face an unprecedented challenge in the coming two decades, as California undergoes a major demographic, social and economic transformation. The Community Colleges are at the center of this change, and the state's future as a healthy and free, diverse and creative society, depends in no little part upon the commitments expressed through and in the community colleges.

This is not hyperbole; the community colleges educate hundreds of thousands of Californians every year, they are the route to higher education for the majority of our people, they provide access to language and citizenship for tens of thousands of immigrants annually, they retrain workers in an economy changing more rapidly than any in history, they are the last hope for older citizens seeking skills and involvement in their communities. To do these things well, to bring excitement and power into the lives of students so diverse and needing so much, to serve the economy and society through its service of these students--this requires a deep commitment from all who teach and learn, from those who administer and counsel, from those who fund and regulate.

The Community Colleges embody an historic commitment to provide an opportunity for college instruction for all Californians capable of benefiting from instruction. The Colleges have historically found their Mission in the statewide plan for higher education--the Master Plan--and in local commitments to meet the needs of different communities--urban and rural, middle class and poor. From these sources have come the conviction--and the fact--that the colleges ought to provide high quality lower division instruction for purposes of transfer to baccalaureate institutions, and a wide range of courses and programs to meet vocational and basic education needs. The colleges have been notable because they were local and accessible, diverse in their responsiveness to local needs, and yet maintained standards capable of placing students in any of the state's Universities or employable in any of the state's industries.

Since the original Master Plan, there has been a significant change in the populations served by the Community Colleges, and in the anticipated needs of the state as we move into the 21st century.

The state's population will grow by 25 percent between 1986 and 2000, from 25.5 million to roughly 32 million. By the turn of the century California will have a cultural and ethnic pluralism unknown elsewhere in the mainland United States. 52 percent of the school-age children in 2000 will be minorities; the majority of the population will be nonwhite early into the following decade. But there is no one "minority community;" there will be recent immigrants from Asia and Central America, the children of today's urban ghettos, members of the "working poor." Whether it be language training, job reskilling, technical education or the liberal arts, these communities of Californians will turn increasingly to the Community Colleges. And given the pitiful record of the primary and secondary

schools in educating or (even) retaining minorities, the Community Colleges will continue to be their last hope for any education at all.

By the year 2000, California will be proportionally older; 19 percent will be senior citizens. California will have more elderly citizens than any other state in the nation. These citizens will turn, as they have already, to the Community Colleges for continuing education and job skills.

And by the turn of the century more and more working men and women will come to the community colleges for job skills and retraining. In an economy of rapid change and intense international competition, there will be much job displacement, sometimes on a massive scale. The periodic recession, the unpredicted collapse of a market or an industry--all will bring new students to the colleges. But inside the economic center--not just at its margins--the workers of the future will need new literacy skills, more ability to communicate and learn on their own. And when some analysts predict a labor shortage in California by 2000, the real issue will not be numbers but quality; will working men and women have the skills required for jobs of rapid transformation? Will California be able to compete economically with other states now making massive investment in their educational systems?

Let us not be sanguine or romantic about this future of rapid change. The convergence of these tendencies--both demographic and economic--lead to the possibility of an increasingly stratified society. This can include what Cornel Meier calls a "permanent underclass," mostly minority, and a semi-permanent semi-employable stratum of low-skilled workers. The consequences of this are dire: the permanent under-utilization of the energies and talents of our people, the deepening of racial resentments and fears, and the constant anxiety among more and more of us that the future has no a place for us.

We are committed to an alternative vision, in which California remains a place of opportunity and hope, where innovation and creativity mark our economy and our culture, where the minds and spirits of all our communities contribute to our common future.

The Community Colleges will be at the heart of whatever effort we make to insure that the future is equitable and open, that California's economy remains healthy and growing, that both rural towns and rapidly expanding urban centers have educational resources close at hand. The Community Colleges are not the only place in which Californians will make their investment for an expansive and decent future, but they will have to be one such place.

What will it mean that these colleges--once envisaged as "Junior Colleges" devoted primarily to providing middle-class youth with a local option to the lower-division years of college--will be called upon for the tasks of retraining workers, teaching English to those recently among us, providing skills and opportunities for the elderly, providing a second

chance to those who were failed by our secondary schools, and still provide lower division transfer education of quality and integrity for all who want it?

Some fear that they will cease to be colleges, as if "college" stood as an abstract category in which students do a fairly narrow set of things. Others will welcome this new epoch as a challenge of unprecedented opportunity: does this state have the wit and the will to forge a new range of educational engagements for our people? Can the faculty honor those who teach basic skills and literacy--as well as those who teach Shakespeare and Plato? Can "vocational" and "liberal arts" talk to each other in an epoch where all vocations will require deeper and more subtle forms of literacy? Can we build a new and diverse curriculum which engages all our diverse students, and demands the best of their minds and spirits?

At the heart of it all will be a form of pride. We can be proud of a system of community colleges which insists upon pride among its students and faculty, where rigor and standards are an assumed part of a shared effort to educate, where the hugely diverse needs of students are a challenge rather than a threat, where the Community Colleges serve as models for new curricula and innovative teaching, where learning is what we care about most.

The following proposals intend to strengthen the colleges' capacity to meet the emerging needs of our state. These are the overriding goals: to better insure that all Californians are offered a chance, challenged and taught with imagination and inspiration, offered assistance and counseling and held to honest standards. The proposals come together as a package; they are linked together both conceptually and practically. Thus, matriculation requires staff development, faculty renewal requires changes in both faculty governance and intellectual environment, a new set of priorities and goals requires funding formulae capable of ensuring the colleges' capacity to perform--and be held accountable.

II. ACCESS/SUCCESS

To assure that California enjoys a healthy economy and society, open access to a quality Community College must be affirmed for a diverse student population. This diversity reflects the diversity of the state; Community College students are recent high school graduates and senior citizens, white and black, Asian and Hispanic, disabled men and women, middle class and low-income, business men and women, single parents, re-entry women, drop outs and university graduates. As a society and a state, we have a responsibility to provide to every Californian the opportunity to further develop and realize his or her intellectual, emotional, and vocational potential.

These students' goals and aspirations are equally diverse: literacy training, English acquisition and development for native and non-native speakers, vocational training, job re-skilling, skills enhancement and transfer education. Often times, the goals change during the course of the educational experience; students entering for literacy training or English acquisition realize they possess vocational or transfer education skills. The heart off education is assisting the individual to get from where they are upon entering the Community College to where they want to be. The responsibility and accountability for the growth and development which occurs between these two points lies with both the student and the college.

Access to education is only meaningful if there are programs which assist students in identifying their talents and abilities, directs them to courses which provide what they need and insists upon maintaining standards which can guide them to success.

Assessment, Counseling and Placement

We propose that:

1. The Legislature hereby reaffirms its commitment to open access to community colleges for all adults who can benefit from instruction, and further affirms that access is only meaningful if it is connected to programs which can best guarantee success for students. Such programs must include a system of assessment, counseling, and placement, to better ensure that students are placed in courses in which they can be expected to succeed.

2. It is the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Governors shall cause to be implemented in all local districts, a system of assessment, counseling, placement for all students seeking access to courses and programs. Assessment shall include both cognitive and noncognitive skills include face-to-face personal assessment of individual motivations and aspirations. The assessment results shall be the basis for development of an educational plan created by the student and counselor. This system shall include frequent follow-up on the progress of each student with the necessary subsequent counseling, and assistance provided to detect academic difficulties.

3. It is the intent of the Legislature that a mandatory assessment and counseling system is intended to facilitate, and not restrict, access to college instruction, and to further enhance student awareness of his or her own abilities, skills and potential. To implement this intention, the Board of Governors shall form a task force of teachers, administrators, and support staff to evaluate existing assessment instruments and processes, with a view to identifying a range of instruments which are both reliable and sensitive to cultural and linguistic differences; this range of instruments shall then be available to local districts for use.

4. It is the intent of the Legislature that local districts and colleges shall develop community outreach programs directed at targeted populations which explain that a mandatory assessment and counseling system is intended to facilitate, and not restrict, access to college instruction, and to further enhance student awareness of his or her own abilities, skills and potential.

5. It is the intent of the Legislature that local districts and colleges shall develop orientation programs to explain academic requirements and regulations and student support services available to facilitate success.

6. It is the intent of the Legislature that access to the colleges shall not mean access to every and all courses or programs without assessment and counseling. Upon adequate assessment, students are to be counseled as to the appropriate courses in which it is expected that they will do best. And students will not have access to courses which have established course prerequisites.

7. It is further the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Governors shall instruct the local districts and colleges to initiate a review of the skill requirements for all entry level courses; this review shall be available to all counselors for purposes of more precise and careful counseling of students.

8. It is further the intent of the Legislature that the skill requirements for entry level courses be widely publicized throughout the local area feeder schools, that the colleges develop orientation programs in local high schools to explain both expected college skills and available support services.

9. It is the intent of the Legislature that the State Chancellor's Office review the local district plans and methodologies used to determine course and program skill requirements, and that such plans and methods shall not be implemented until approval by the Chancellor's Office.

10. It is further our intention that all districts shall undertake a review of their departments and programs with regard to the availability of courses which would satisfy the diversity of student need.

11. It is the understanding of the Legislature that a statewide system of assessment, counseling and placement depends for its integrity upon the training of college staff in the methods and interpretation of formal assessment instruments, and in the diverse needs and backgrounds of the colleges' students. The Legislature further declares that any system of assessment, counseling and placement must involve the faculty. It is therefore the intent of the Legislature that there shall be developed in each district

programs of staff and faculty development aiming to instruct faculty and staff in these matters.

12. It is our belief that the full implementation of an assessment, counseling and placement system must include an adequate review of its success, over review periods of two years. Such reviews shall include but not be limited to retention rates, transfer and vocational completion rates, improved skill levels as measured by exit testing of courses, impact of programs on gender and ethnic representation. It is our intent that the Chancellor's Office shall develop a system of review and report to the Legislature upon completion of the initial review. (cf MPC REC #33)

13. It is the intent of the Legislature that to further enhance success, local districts and colleges shall develop career resource and placement centers to maintain information on vocational, technological and educational opportunities, as well as facilitate career employment.

14. It is the understanding of the Legislature that this system of assessment, counseling and placement represents a major commitment of personnel and resources on the part of the colleges. There is a need for computer monitoring systems, additional staff, staff and faculty training, adequate oversight staff and resources in the Chancellor's Office. The program's success, further, depends on the successful implementation of other proposals of this report—and upon the State's willingness to commit adequate resources to it.

III. MISSION AND FUNCTIONS

The Community Colleges do many things, but what are their primary goals? What ends do they serve in California's future, as we make the transition into the next century? Any statement of Mission serves to clarify what we believe the colleges ought to care about; it also serves to identify what the state really needs.

We believe the Community Colleges will be called upon to serve three major ends as we move into the next century. First, they must provide transfer education of the finest quality for all those who choose to pursue a baccalaureate degree—and whose circumstances or prior experience make it difficult or hard for them to attend either university system. The lower division general education, liberal arts and science courses, should be of equal or superior quality to that offered in either university system, and students who seek to transfer should be guaranteed that their success in community colleges will insure entrance to the universities.

Second, the community colleges will play a pivotal role in the provision of quality vocational education in an economy of increasing complexity and rapid change. Indeed, we believe that the Community Colleges should play a central role in reorganizing the bewildering array of vocational programs offered throughout the state, and that a thorough review of vocational education will be required in the context of the overall Master Plan review.

Third, the Community Colleges will continue to provide quality programs in transitional education for hundreds of thousands of California's citizens. No one can believe that the state's need for adult literacy, skill remediation at all levels, and English as a second language will decrease in the next 25 years. In these areas, the alternative adult education programs have been at their limits for years, and currently turn students away for lack of space. The need, in brief, is monumental, especially if California is to have a literate and productive population. We call this cluster of educational programs "transitional" because they provide a crucial transition to genuine opportunity for newer immigrants (ESL), and the underprepared student (Remediation). Community Colleges have programs of quality and integrity in these areas; they must be strengthened, given appropriate standards and made accountable for the success of their students.

15. In sum, we affirm that the three primary Missions are:
    1. Transfer Education
    2. Vocational Education
    3. Transitional Education

16. Further, we affirm that state-funded, non-credit adult education should be an essential and important function of the Community Colleges. In a variety of areas these courses meet the essential needs of diverse local communities. These courses are especially critical for citizens seeking literacy, the elderly, the disabled, and recent immigrants. In all these areas, the offerings of the colleges are essential for the continuing health and successful integration of citizens into the society.

17. Further, we affirm that fee-based community service education should be affirmed as an authorized function of the Community Colleges, especially where such programs meet demonstrated local needs. We feel it important that these courses have integrity, that their inclusion into the planning of the colleges not harm the programs and offerings in other areas, and that they be genuinely and full fee-supported.

Finally, we affirm that excellent student services programs must be understood as an essential and important part of the Community Colleges' capacity to perform their functions and meet their goals.

Our detailed proposals concerning the colleges' missions and functions will be provided in the following sections.

Transfer Education

As the Master Plan Commission has noted in their report, there are a variety of factors contributing to the decline in the numbers of students seeking to transfer from the Community Colleges to the university systems, ranging from decreased numbers of high school graduates to inadequate financial aid. But whatever the cause, the decline represents a serious threat to the long tradition of collegiate work in the colleges--as well as a threat to the oldest claims of the community colleges to provide access to quality education regardless of family or personal circumstance. We believe that a reinvigorated transfer program in the Community Colleges--and the sharing of responsibility for its success with the other segments--is a key element in the colleges' ability to meet the needs of the state in the coming years.

Therefore, we propose that it be the intent of the Legislature:

18. That the Board of Governors, the Regents of the University of California, and the Trustees of the California State University, with appropriate faculty consultation, cooperatively develop and maintain a general education transfer core curriculum which, with the courses required for specific majors, will ensure transfer to the University of California or the California State University systems upon successful completion of the appropriate courses and maintenance of the requisite grade point average. (MPC REC. #8)

19. That the Board of Governors communicate the core curriculum to the State Board of Education to be used as part of its curriculum development procedures, so that secondary school students are aware of the requirements for collegiate preparation and transfer and can receive any necessary remediation at the earliest possible opportunity. (MPC REC. #9)

20. That the specific requirements for collegiate preparation and transfer be published jointly by the Board of Governors, the Regents of the University of California, and the Trustees of the California State University, and distributed to all junior high schools, high schools, and community colleges in California, with particular attention to schools with high minority student populations. (MPC REC. #10)

21. That the Board of Governors redesign both the Associate in Arts (AA) and the Associate in Science (AS) degree requirements to include the transfer core curriculum, courses for specific college majors, and elective requirements. No courses beyond these areas should be required for the AA or AS degrees. Degrees should be awarded upon completion of the core curriculum, major, and elective requirements. (MPC REC. #11)

22. That the Board of Governors invite and encourage the independent four-year institutions to participate in the development of the core curriculum and the efforts to improve the transfer function, and to consider their applicability to their own institutions. *(MPC REC. #13)*

23. That the Commission for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, as part of its continuing study of the relationships between the three segments of higher education, examine the current ratios of lower-division students attending each of the systems, and determine if an adjustment is in order--to help insure that adequate places in upper-division majors remain open for community college transfer students.

Vocational Education

We reaffirm that vocational and technical education is a central part of the Mission of the California Community Colleges, and that programs of study leading to employment meet the needs of both students and society. It is our conviction, however, that the dramatic changes in California's economy will require a thorough review of the relevance and responsiveness of current vocational programs, as well as the relationship between the various and many programs throughout the state. It is the expectation of the Legislature that the Master Plan Commission will conduct such a review, and it is further our expectation that the Board of Governors shall initiate, through the Chancellor's Office, a more detailed examination of the implications of current economic developments and trends for the development of vocational programs. In agriculture, manufacturing, and the services sectors, new technologies, the reorganization of production, and the shifting international context require such a review. The future development of vocational programs should be informed by a richer analysis of these economic developments. We propose:

24. That it is the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Governors shall direct the Chancellor's Office to establish an "Office of Economic Research and Review" to monitor on-going macroeconomic and employment data, to initiate dialogue with industry groups, to assist districts in identifying future needs and vocational programs.

It is our understanding that current vocational programs in the Community Colleges appropriately include both certificate/degree programs and short-term jobs skills and retraining programs. Both are essential to meet the rapidly shifting needs within the economy. Within a variety of programs, however, there is a need for greater continuity between the high schools, Community Colleges, and University systems.

Therefore, we propose that it be the intent of the Legislature:

25. That the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education, with appropriate faculty consultation, help local high schools and Community Colleges to establish closely articulated "2+2" programs--two years in high school, two in a Community College--where such programs would meet local student and employer needs, and that in cooperation with the Trustees of the California State University, with appropriate faculty consultation, develop articulated "2+2+2" vocational programs leading to the baccalaureate degree where appropriate. (MPC REC. #15)

It is further our belief that vocational "tracks" should have as much connection as possible with courses in the liberal arts and general education. This ensures career options for students, and addresses a growing conviction on the part of industry that vocational training must include a broad variety of literacy skills beyond technical expertise. We believe that the Chancellor's Office should initiate a review of the curricular relationships between vocational and general education programs. And with regard to transfer vocational programs, it is our intent,

26. That the Board of Governors and the Trustees of the California State University cooperatively establish vocational education transfer programs, ensuring articulation at both the State and local levels, with faculty from both segments cooperating in curriculum development. Vocational students seeking an AS degree should be required to satisfy the transfer core curriculum and courses specific to occupational major requirements. Local colleges should be authorized to award the AS degree upon completion of the transfer core curriculum, occupational major, and elective requirements. (MPC REC. #16)

We agree with the Master Plan Commission that there exists patterns of gender and ethnic underrepresentation in a number of vocational programs. (As an example, in 15 of the 30 largest programs over 80 percent of the students are of the same gender.) It is our intent, therefore,

27. That the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education each identify their vocational programs that show evidence of underrepresentation of specific groups and together assist the colleges in developing programs, in cooperation with local secondary schools, to encourage students to enter those vocational programs in which they are underrepresented. (MPC REC. #14)

We are concerned about the lack of information and data concerning the success rates (as measured by skill assessment, as well as job placement and employment) in vocational programs. We believe it would be useful if the Chancellor's Office implemented a uniform reporting procedure for vocational programs, including placement by gender and ethnicity. Such a reporting procedure is essential if the Board of Governors, the Legislature, and the Governor are to assess the colleges' success in fulfilling this mission. To these ends, it is our intention:

28. That the Board of Governors establish research and evaluation programs for vocational-student and employer follow-up at both the State and local levels, to determine whether vocational programs are functioning effectively and meeting student and employer needs. The Board of Governors should establish statewide evaluation measures for comparative purposes and assist the colleges in designing appropriate research and follow-up mechanisms. Results should be published statewide in a timely fashion. (MPC REC. #32)

We are familiar with current proposals concerning the establishment of an additional degree for employment certification in the Community Colleges (the AAS degree), and the identification of certain colleges as technical colleges. We are not persuaded that the implications of an additional degree are adequately understood, and it is, therefore our intent,

29. That the Board of Governors and the California Postsecondary Education Commission study the appropriateness of the AAS degree, the experience of other states and the implications for California, and report back to the Legislature by January 1, 1987.

Finally, we believe that the comprehensive mission of the Community Colleges is appropriate, and that is is, therefore, inappropriate that colleges have the option of designating themselves technical colleges.

Transitional Education

We believe the following programs should be identified under this category: Remedial Education and English as a Second Language (ESL). Our review of the historic passage through which California is moving suggests that these programs are essential if we are to address the problems of productivity and participation in the economy and society. In each of these areas there is monumental social need, a lack of leadership and coordination in existing programs, and confusion concerning standards and accountability. The community colleges have the infrastructure and personnel, the experience and the knowledge; it is our intent that the colleges assume leadership in coordinating programs in these areas.

Remediation

The Master Plan Commission reports:

"The demand for remedial education has increased in all postsecondary segments, but especially in the Community Colleges, because of the decline in high school standards, the increasing dropout rate, the cap on growth of adult education programs in the public schools, and the growing numbers of adults who seek basic skills, language, and literacy training. While higher proportions of ethnic minority students need remedial courses and programs, the need cuts across all ethnic groups and affects students from all socioeconomic backgrounds, high school graduates or not."

It is our conviction that remedial education meets a massive and growing need in the state. Remedial education provides the crucial transition to opportunity for the underprepared student, and the community colleges have considerable experience in offering students such opportunity. At the same time, we believe that there must be better coordination between adult education programs and community college programs at the local level, and we, therefore, affirm the necessity of locally negotiated agreements between the institutions providing remediation. Students in any programs must have readily available information concerning the connection between his or her current courses and the "next" stage through which he or she might pass.

Regarding remedial education, we affirm:

30. That the success of the assessment, counseling, and placement system depends upon the ability of the colleges to provide a full range of skill-remediation instruction and support services for those students needing assistance.

31. That students enrolled in remedial instruction courses shall be required, as are all other students, to demonstrate consistent and steady progress toward the attainment of college-level courses in a reasonable period of time. It shall be the task of counseling and support-service staff, along with the faculty, to assess the progress of each student. It is the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Governors shall examine and review the current system-wide standards for student probation and dismissal, and that these standards be widely known and understood by staff evaluating student progress.

32. That students requiring remedial instruction be directed and counseled to seek such instruction. Enrollment in non-remedial courses should be contingent upon the completion of course prerequisites, where applicable.

33. That the Board of Governors establish a limit to the number of units of remedial coursework a student may take. The Commission endorses a limit of thirty semester or forty-five quarter credit units. Students needing additional remedial work should be directed to noncredit adult basic education programs, in either the Community Colleges or the adult schools, or to other community-based services. English as a Second Language and learning-disbled students should be exempt from the unit limit, and college counselors should be permitted to request waivers for students who reach the unit limit but are still showing significant, measurable progress toward acquisition of college-level skills. (MPC REC. #22)

English as a Second Language

Courses in English as a Second Language (ESL) are the single largest category of courses, with the largest enrollment, across all segments of education in California. These courses are the heart of California's transition to a future as a multicultural society in which men and women of diverse backgrounds can also share a common language. For hundreds of thousands of recent immigrants from Central and Latin America and Asia, ESL courses offer the critical transition from exclusion to inclusion, from silence to participation. In San Francisco alone, one of every three limited English speaking adults is currently enrolled in ESL courses offered through the College Centers division of the local district.

The students moving through this transition are enormously varied. They may be California-born, lacking both reading and computational skills as well as English; they may be literate in their own language, or not; they might have advanced degree from their original homeland, have professional and technical skills. This diversity reveals a critical insight: English as a Second Language is not remediation; it does not represent the effort to retrain. It is a new skill for men and women often perfectly competent in their own language.

We affirm the historic importance of courses and program in English as a Second Language. We recognize that current programs offered in the Community Colleges and the adult schools are inadequate to meet a growing need throughout the State. We, therefore, believe that the Community Colleges should take a lead position in coordinating programs in this area.

We propose that:

34. It is the intent of the Legislature that the Board of Governors and the State Department of Education undertake a review, with the assistance of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, of the future needs in the area of ESL, and seek programs of cooperation between the different local programs attempting to meet this need. The results of this review are to be delivered to the Legislature no later than January 1, 1988.

State-funded Non-Credit Adult Education

The Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education states:

> "Adult literacy training and basic skills education are expected to join English as a Second Language and Remediation as the most difficult challenges facing California education in the next 15 years."

The Commission may understate the case. Using 1980 census figures, up to 25 percent of California's adult population may be functionally illiterate. The State Department of Education estimates that between 4 and 4-1/2 million California adults may be illiterate; in Los Angeles alone, 465,000 out of 2.3 million adults are estimated illiterate. While precise

estimates vary, this means a huge number of Californians cannot read the newspaper, cannot read work manuals, cannot read labels on cans of poison, cannot assess the written claims of businesses or politicians. There may be a connection between America's illiteracy rate and our low rate of voting. Our illiteracy is worse than that of any other industrial democracy, and the percentage of our citizens voting in elections is the lowest of any democracy in the entire world, with the exception of Botswana.

The cost to the state is incalculable--in terms of lost productivity, higher welfare and public assistance expenditures, unemployment and crime, social isolation and personal exclusion. Democracy itself depends upon an informed and engaged population, one capable of making informed choices. Community College courses in non-credit adult education address the problem of illiteracy in addition to essential programs in nine other areas. We affirm that these programs are essential and important functions of the California Community Colleges. At the same time, we note that these programs are also offered by other institutions and governed by a variety of authorities. The programs offered within Community Colleges have quality and integrity; they should be strengthened further. But their relationship to other programs must be clarified.

Therefore, we propose that it be the intent of the Legislature:

35. That the California Postsecondary Education Commission, in consultation with the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education, conduct a study of the current and projected need for and funding of non-credit adult education, including the ten state-funded areas, in the Community Colleges and public school system adult schools in light of the State's changing demographics. (MPC REC. #26)

36. That the Legislature strengthen the current statutes by mandating local delineation of function agreements. The agreements should be reviewed and approved by the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education. Sanctions for noncompliance should be established in order to ensure cooperation between the public schools and the Community Colleges. (Such sanctions could include the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education each selecting one representative, and these two selecting a third person, to draft delineation of function agreements for any districts that are not able to reach agreement. An additional sanction could include the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education jointly agreeing not to release any funds for noncredit adult education to a particular region, pending signing and filing of the delineation of function agreement.) (MPC REC. 27)

37. Finally, we are aware of real and substantial inequities in the financial support afforded different programs in this area. It is our intent that the California Postsecondary Education Commission

prepare a study of the financing of the different systems providing adult basic education, including salary schedules for persons teaching in various programs, and report back to the Legislature on the implications and effect of these differences.

Fee-Based Community Services

These offerings include avocational, recreational, and professional in-service classes as well as cultural and community programs. In many communities, particularly in rural areas, the colleges are the only resources available for such programs of enrichment. They are especially important--along with state supported non-credit adult programs--for senior citizens. We believe these courses are valuable and necessary, and also believe that they should be fully supported by user fees. Finally, we believe these programs must not inhibit the colleges' commitment and ability to fully develop their primary commitment in other areas.

We propose that it be the intent of the Legislature that:

38. That the Board of Governors collect statewide data on community service programs and institute full, uniform cost accounting procedures, including direct and indirect costs, to ensure that no State funds are used for their support. (MPC REC. #28)

39. That the Legislature, having already established the "no State support/full fee support" policy for community service programs, establish no further rules regarding these programs. (MPC REC. #29)

40. That the colleges continue to offer community service classes according to the interests of the community, as long as those classes are fully user fee supported and do not detract from the colleges' primary responsibilities. (MPC REC. #30)

IV. FACULTY, ADMINISTRATORS, AND STAFF

Education is not adequately defined by Mission statements, the names of programs, or the process guaranteeing access or standards. It lives in the encounter between student and teacher, in the animated dialogue among students, in the silence of reading or the quiet completion of a piece of work. Education escapes, finally, even the bureaucracies which house it or the funds which fuel it. It only happens through the complexity of mind and commitment of spirit which makes teaching a true vocation and being a student a rare joy.

We recognize the subtlety of good teaching, and value those who do it well and with passion. We further understand that none of the State's needs will be met unless we have trained and committed faculty, joined by

talented service staff and administrators. And while it remains obvious that the State requires faculty who are technically qualified and professionally trained, we believe that the tasks faced by Community College faculty require more. Our goal must be to create the best conditions under which men and women can commit themselves to teaching, the finest environments in which their minds and spirits are free to engage their students and each other. This vision must inform our recommendations, else they be programs without meaning in a context where meaning is all.

The following proposals combine with proposals made elsewhere under "Governance" to effect a major shift in the organization and governance of faculty affairs. In sum, and taking the proposals as a whole, we aim to increase the authority of a permanent full-time and tenured faculty more into the affairs of the college, while decreasing the districts' current dependence upon part-time temporary faculty. We intend that the faculty assume its proper role as a professional collegiate body. At the same time, we wish to strengthen the role and stability of those support and service staff without whom the entire process of assessment and counseling cannot succeed, and whose continuing engagement with students is a precondition of their success.

Credentials

We are not persuaded that the current credentialing system insures either quality or professionalism; it certainly has nothing to do with personal commitments or care. The requirements are minimalist, the procedures automatic, the standards totally abstract. The idea of minimal criteria for faculty hires in unassailable; the real issues are: who should make the standards, who should make the hires, on what criteria? We believe that the question of standards is, finally, also a question of governance. If the faculty were more involved in the setting of standards and the real decisions of hiring, current credentials would be largely irrelevant. Absent those elements, we are also aware that simply eliminating credentials is beside the point.

It is our intent:

41. That the existing credentialing system for community college faculty be deleted from the Education Code by January 1, 1988 on condition:

42. That the Board of Governors direct the Office of the Chancellor to convene a Faculty Commission, with broad representation from all segments of the faculty and administration--paying special attention to the representation of faculty from different disciplines, programs, liberal arts and vocational training, remediation, and adult education, as well as gender and ethnic representation--to determine a new system of qualifications for employment of faculty and administrators. This report is to be

submitted to the Board of Governors by October 1, 1987, and approved by them by December 31, 1987.

It is our belief, further,

43. That the Board of Governors, in consultation with the above-mentioned Commission, should determine a process through which new faculty hires are subject to peer review, preferably on a departmental or division basis. This process is to be put in place no later than January 1, 1988.

Recruitment and Affirmative Action

The California Community Colleges will face a severe hiring crisis in the next fifteen years. It is estimated that fully 55 percent of the current full-time faculty will retire in that period. There are three interlocking issues. First, there must be guarantees that these full-time positions are not divided into cheaper part-time positions, as is all too often the case currently. The maintenance of a fully staffed, full-time faculty is an essential element of a coherent program. Second, the very availability of qualified persons to fill these positions is in doubt. Competition for qualified persons is intense, from both other sectors of education and private business.

Finally, given the emerging turnover in faculty hiring, the next fifteen years represents the last major "window of opportunity" for the next 30 years to significantly change the ethnic mix within the faculty. Especially when the student body is changing, it will be imperative that the faculty be sympathetic and sensitive to the cultural diversity in the colleges; one means of ensuring this is a more representative balance among the faculty.

We propose, therefore, that it is the intent of the Legislature:

44. That the Commission on Financial Aid and the California Postsecondary Education Commission explore programs intended to increase the possibility of students entering the teaching profession in Community Colleges. Among the proposals we believe ought to be explored is a program of "floating grants," awarded to second-year community college students who evidence an interest in teaching, to be used during their second year at community college, then transferable for two subsequent years to any four-year institution in California, followed by three years of guaranteed graduate loans—such loans to be forgiven on a year-by-year basis if the student teaches in a Community College. A report on this and other proposals is to be delivered to the Legislature no later than January 1, 1987.

45. That local districts and colleges explore agreements between their academic departments and graduate departments in adjoining campuses

of the University of California--such agreements aiming to provide part-time temporary positions to advanced graduate students with proven teaching experience (as Teaching Assistants). Such positions would serve as a form of financial aid for the graduate student--especially for minority students--would also serve as recruitment avenues into Community College faculty ranks, and would guarantee the Community College departments one or two part-time temporary positions each year. The final hiring choices remain those of the Community College department and administration, from a pool of candidates provided by the UC graduate department. Such a program must include provisions that persons currently teaching in part-time temporary positions not be displaced.

46. That the California Postsecondary Education Commission study the design and feasibility of programs of graduate study leading to the Doctorate of Arts in Teaching as currently offered by Carnegie-Mellon University. This degree is explicitly designed for men and women who seek an academic career in teaching and who are less involved in discipline-based research. CPEC is to deliver its critique, including the possibility of such degrees being offered through California's institutions, to the Legislature by July 1, 1987.

47. That the Board of Governors shall prepare a plan for strengthening Community College faculty and staff affirmative action policies and programs, and monitor and publish the results by college. Such policies and programs should include ethnic minorities, women, and disabled persons, and should establish local goals and expectations regarding affirmative action. The plan should include clear lines of district accountability for its success and ensure participation in and commitment to effective affirmative action by district trustees, administrators, and faculty alike. (c.f. MPC REC. #36)

48. That the Chancellor's Office shall monitor local district and college progress, and where that progress fails to meet established goals, the Chancellor's Office shall mandate a review of local programs by a technical assistance team from the Chancellor's Office.

Employment of Part-Time Faculty

If the Community Colleges are to respond creatively to the challenges of the coming decades, they must have a strong and stable core of full-time faculty with long-term commitments to their colleges. Most of our proposals in this report depend upon such a cadre of full-time faculty. We are concerned about the effect of an over-reliance upon part-time faculty, particularly in the core transfer curricula. Under current conditions, part-time faculty, no matter how talented as teachers, rarely participate in college programs, design departmental curricula, or advise and counsel students. Even if they were invited to do so by their colleagues, it may

be impossible if they are simultaneously teaching at three or four other colleges in order to make a decent living.

At the same time, we are aware that in many areas the employment of part-time temporary faculty is both appropriate and necessary--especially in vocational programs where faculty may be practicing professionals in the field. It is our belief, however, that decisions regarding the appropriateness of part-time faculty should be made on the basis of academic and program needs, and not for financial savings. It was the Legislature's concern about abuses in this regard that led to the establishment of the current statutory cap on part-time employment.

We are concerned about the current tendency to fill "retiring" full-time positions with multiple part-time positions, and we are further aware of the current financial incentive to do so. Under current formulae, part-time faculty receive less money than do full-time faculty (on any prorated accounting), and do not receive benefits. Thus, proposals concerning the status and conditions of part-time faculty will depend upon changes in the pay structure as well as the overall financing of the colleges.

We propose that it be the intent of the Legislature:

49. That the current statutory restriction on the employment of part-time faculty be maintained pending the development of a statewide policy for the Community Colleges by the Board of Governors. Such a policy must have the objective of strengthening the core of experienced full-time faculty in each department. Such a policy might appropriately be developed through a process of faculty consultation at the local colleges, and include district differentials in the ratios of part-time and full-time--such differentials to be approved by the Chancellor's Office. (see, for contrast, MPC, REC. #37)

50. That the Board of Governors develop policies requiring that part-time faculty who enjoy contractual status (see following recommendation), must participate in student advisement and curricular development in addition to classroom instruction. Part-time faculty are to be compensated for this participation. (c.f. MPC RECS. #38 and #44). This policy is obviously dependent upon the completion of the pilot project detailed in the following recommendation.

51. That the Board of Governors develop, and one or more districts adopt, a pilot program of two year "rolling" contracts for selected categories of part-time temporary faculty. Such a program shall include both peer and student review. Upon the completion of the pilot project, the Board of Governors is to develop, in consultation with the faculty, a policy of two-to-five year rolling contracts for selected categories of part-time faculty. Such a

policy must be compatible with the Board of Governors' overall policy concerning the strengthening of the full-time faculty, and not be regarded as a substitute for the recruitment and tenuring of full-time faculty. (c.f. MPC RECS. #39 and #42).

52. That the Board of Governors create and the Legislature fund a Special Instructional Fund (SIF) to be disbursed by the Board of Governors to local districts which make significant progress towards improving the ratio of full-time and part-time faculty. Such progress shall be defined by the hiring of probationary full-time faculty to replace part-time temporary positions, (and, thus, improvement is not based on the simple expedient of laying off part-time faculty). Funds from the SIF shall be used for the development of new instructional programs which require additional "start-up" monies.

Tenure

We affirm the importance of the tenure system as the prerequisite for the maintenance of academic freedom, continuity in academic and vocational programs, and the development of a faculty committed to the long-term health of the community colleges. At the same time, we understand the tenure system to be a central part of the governance of the colleges. Thus, the determination of standards for tenure, procedures governing tenure, and the actual granting of tenure determine in large part the substantive direction of the colleges.

We find that the current tenure system lacks adequate participation by the faculty, provides an inadequate probationary period for the evaluation of permanent faculty, and does not provide uniform system-wide procedures for due process and grievance. Therefore, we propose that it is the intent of the Legislature:

53. That the Board of Governors, in consultation with the faculty, develop a formal system of peer review prior to the granting of tenure, and periodic evaluation of part-time, probationary, and tenured faculty by their peers, students and administrators. Such a system must include adequate due process protections and grievance procedures. (c.f. MPC REC. #41)

54. That the Board of Governors undertake a review of current practices concerning the tenuring of college administrators, and develop a process of peer and faculty review for administrators.

55. That current statute be amended to lengthen the probationary period to four years. Thus, during the fourth year of probationary service a review shall be undertaken of the probationary faculty's performance, according to the procedures determined by the Board in consultation with the faculty. In the years prior to formal evaluation, termination during the first year will not be subject

to due process. The denial of tenure shall be subject to due process and grievance, and shall be automatically followed by a fifth or "terminal" year of employment (as is the case in other segments of higher education).

Collective Bargaining

We recognize that changes in the governance of the colleges will affect, and be affected by, current collective bargaining agreements and the statutes governing those agreements. Both with regard to jurisdictional matters and questions of process, there can be considerable confusion regarding the relationship between collective bargaining agents, academic units organized through the colleges (departments and schools), and the academic senates. We are not persuaded that these matters are well understood currently.

Therefore, we propose that it is the intent of the Legislature:

56. That the Board of Governors review the Education Employment Relations Act with regard to the delineation of roles and responsibilities of the Academic Senate and the faculty bargaining agents, especially in light of proposed changes in the role of faculty concerning hiring, peer review and evaluation, and curricular design. Such a review might properly result in proposed legislation submitted to the Legislature.

Student Services Staff

We affirm that the success of the assessment, counseling, and placement system will depend upon the commitment and dedication of trained student services staff. But the importance of their role stretches across all aspects of Community College life--in counseling, reading and computational assessment and evaluation, financial aid assistance, providing and directing tutorial services, providing outreach into the local community and information to continuing students, and assisting the faculty in designing and providing courses of study which meet the particular needs of very different students. We are concerned that the college have adequate service staff, and that they be superbly trained, especially in view of the current diversity in the colleges. It is our intention:

57. That the differential funding system developed by the Board of Governors adequately assess the workload factors for student services staff, especially in view of the requirements of the assessment, counseling and placement system, and that the funding be adequate to insure that there is both sufficient staffing and training for student services programs.

58. That student services staff be included in professional development programs (see below), especially those programs aimed at assessment methodologies, cultural and linguistic issues, program diversity, and personal/motivational factors central to student services.

59. That the CPEC/SAC study of financial aid programs intended to support Community College faculty include the feasibility of including under the same program--with the same loan forgiveness provisions--students who enter student services work as trained professionals.

Professional Development

The Master Plan Commission argues in their report that:

"Community College instructors, recruited directly from graduate school or from some form of employment other than teaching, may not be prepared to deal effectively with the wide range of student abilities and attitudes found in Community College classrooms. As larger numbers of students from many different cultural backgrounds and with significant language and other deficiencies are enrolled, the problem will become more serious for both administrators and faculty. The establishment of the proposed student assessment, counseling, and placement program on each campus will also require additional training and assistance for both faculty and administrators."

We affirm the importance of professional development--for faculty, support staff, student services staff, and administrators--and believe that the Commission is correct in suggesting that the success of the assessment, counseling and placement program will depend upon training of faculty. Such training must include a thorough critique of the methodologies and procedures of current and proposed assessment instruments, the significant variables and errors within all assessment, cultural and linguistic variables in and between the many communities served by the colleges, motivational and other personal factors central to collegiate success. In short, such programs in professional development must seek to engage faculty and administrators in the issues raised by the major transition through which the colleges are moving. It is our intent:

60. That the Board of Governors develop and implement a plan to strengthen professional development programs on Community College campuses. The programs should serve faculty and administrators alike and be closely linked to regular evaluation and promotion procedures. This plan should be supported by an appropriation to the Board of Governors for allocation among the participating colleges. (MPC REC. #46)

Intellectual and Personal Environment

The recruitment of faculty into the Community Colleges, and the maintaining of morale and excitement among the faculty depends in large part upon the intellectual and personal environment within which faculty work. Much of that environment is created by their own authority over the substantive direction of the programs and courses in which they work, through the quality of their relationship with the college administration,

and in the quality of their interactions with the communities of students they teach. At the same time, we recognize that faculty morale comes from their engagement in the development of new and innovative programs, from their engagement in professional and discipline-based associations, from an active intellectual life as scholars and teachers.

We recognize that faculty in the community colleges have substantially less resources available for professional and intellectual advancement than do faculty in the other segments, and that this disparity may become a substantial barrier to the future recruitment of a quality faculty. Yet, faculty in the Community Colleges can be no less intellectually engaged than their colleagues in the other segments. Their primary commitment to teaching makes even more imperative that they have a vibrant and rich intellectual life.

It is thus our intention:

61. That the Education Code governing the Community College Fund for Instructional Improvement be amended to include a category of "programs for the improvement of the intellectual environment of faculty and staff," and that such programs shall include, as eligible for grants:
    --intersegmental summer programs (research projects and seminars)
    --college programs bringing visiting scholars to local districts
    --interdisciplineary programs involving local non-college institutions in the arts and sciences
    --intersegmental research and public information projects on topics of special concern to rural and urban California--regarding the environment, social history, and culture
    --summer "bridge" programs for the transition period into college life.

62. That the Fund for Instructional Improvement be allocated sufficient funds for purposes of these programs and others.

Finally, it is our conviction that a major intellectual task facing the Community Colleges is an ongoing review of the current organization of knowledge and learning through traditional academic disciplines. Especially at the introductory levels, and in many vocational programs, the Community Colleges could become the home of true and genuine interdisciplinary work. Such a focus, even if only in a pilot form, would give the colleges a special appeal to scholars and future teachers whose interests do not lie in the increasingly specialized confines of academic graduate disciplines. With this in mind, we intend:

63. That the Chancellor's Office explore, with the participation of one or more districts, establishing on a pilot basis, "interdisciplinary colleges" within selected colleges--with a special concern with the integration of vocational and academic study. The integration of work experience and study, and the

provision of a more cooperative learning environment as a model for all colleges.

V. GOVERNANCE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The governance system of the California Community Colleges will always bear a set of fundamental tensions. We seek a variety of ends through the governance system--governance which is simultaneously efficient and flexible, provides adequate fiscal oversight from the center and yet local initiative to design programs to meet local needs. These various purposes, and their attendant conflict, ought not to surprise us. They are rooted in a system of astonishing diversity, where local districts have for years been the primary governing structure. Upon this history of local control was grafted a centralized funding mechanism, and a set of legitimate state concerns regarding standards, criteria for programs, and success rates within the colleges.

We recognize the legitimacy of both local and state claims. It is perfectly appropriate that local districts whose communities have long supported their colleges should guard local control. Given the quite different needs of small rural towns and urban centers, of agricultural communities and high-tech suburbs, it is appropriate that local boards, local administrators, and local faculty should regard the development of programs as a local concern. At the same time, the state has a legitimate concern with the overall purposes of the system, the degree to which local programs meet the broad needs of the state, the efficient allocation of resources and overall equity between districts, the determination of standards, the relationship of the community college system with the other two segments of higher education, and the monitoring of the system's effectiveness.

We believe that a system of "Appropriate Governance" is not simply designed. It is built through successive efforts to maintain legitimate claims which sometimes clash. In the end, what constitutes "appropriateness" in any governing system is not its formal elegance, but its effectiveness in providing the services we seek through it. In the case of the community college system, we begin by asserting that the appropriate mode of governance is one of shared responsibility. The faculty should have responsibility over curricular matters, for example, but are appropriately accountable to statewide management standards.

The current division of responsibilities is spelled out in the Education Code, where the formal responsibilities of the Board of Governors and the Local District Boards is elaborated in detail. But such an elaboration does not translate into clarity in practice. We believe there are initiatives which could be undertaken now which could clarify current practice considerably, provide more accountability, and cause the Community College system to function more efficiently and effectively.

Board of Governors

The Education Code grants the Board of Governors broad authority with respect to academic standards, employment standards, program development, data collection, faculty and staff affirmative action, district development and interdistrict relations, budgeting and accounting procedures, relations with other segments and state bodies, as well as other duties. The granting of such authority recognizes that the Community Colleges do constitute a system of higher education--a system with common standards and practices even as it maintains local initiative and control. It is appropriate to make this recognition explicit; therefore, we propose to amend the Education Code to assert:

64. That there be created the California Community Colleges, a postsecondary education system which shall consist of Community College Boards established pursuant to law, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

It is further our intent:

65. That the primary role of the Board of Governors is to exercise broad statewide leadership within the system, to monitor local districts in their efforts to meet state goals, initiate statewide programs, and develop new budgeting priorities and formulae. It is also the appropriate body to provide fiscal management review and assistance in the event local boards encounter severe management difficulties. The responsibilities of the Board of Governor is detailed in current statute.

We agree with the Master Plan Commission that the effective provision of these and other powers requires changes within the structure of the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office. We propose:

66. That the membership of the Board of Governors include 13 appointive members appointed by the Governor and subject to two-thirds confirmation by the Senate, five ex-officio members to include the Governor, the Lt. Governor, the Speaker of the Assembly, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the Chancellor, one voting student representative and one voting faculty member. Members shall be appointed to staggered six year terms.

67. That the membership of the Board of Governors be expanded by two, to include as ex-officio members the President of the University of California and the Chancellor of the California State University; such inclusion is to occur simultaneously with the expansion of both the Board of Regents of the University of California and the Board of Trustees of the California State University to include on both those boards as ex-officio members the Chancellors and/or President of the other two systems.

68. That the Board of Governors shall develop and maintain a classification structure for its employees. The classification structure shall be consistent with the other classification structures for the system-wide operations of the other postsecondary segments, and shall be designed to promote the development of the California Community Colleges as a system. The State Personnel Board and the Department of Personnel Administration shall approve the classification structure unless found substantially incompatible with the laws and regulations governing State Civil Service.

69. That the salaries of employees of the Board of Governors shall not be subject to the approval of the Department of Personnel Administration.

70. That the Legislature authorize the Board of Governors to determine where the Office of the Chancellor should be located so that it can carry out all of its responsibilities most effectively. (MPC REC. #51)

71. That the Legislature direct the Board of Governors to issue an annual public "report card" summarizing important aspects of the educational accomplishments and financial condition of each district according to previously determined measures. (MPC REC. #52)

72. That the Board of Governors be authorized to conduct a management audit of any district according to previously determined criteria; that on the basis of the findings of the management audit the Board be authorized to recommend appropriate changes in the district's management practices. If the district subsequently fails to comply with those recommendations, the Board be authorized to implement appropriate sanctions, including appointment of a special trustee. (MPC REC. #53; this recommendation to follow procedures and provisions of AB 2910—Hughes)

73. That the Board of Governors conduct a thorough review of all statutes affecting the administration and operation of the Community Colleges, and recommend to the Legislature the amendment or repeal of those provisions affected by this set of proposals. Such a review is to be submitted to the Legislature no later than January 15, 1987.

74. That the Board of Governors, in cooperation with the districts and other interested agencies, prepare and administer a systematic training program for district governing board members that covers district financial management, academic policy making, collective bargaining, statewide standards, and other matters essential to the effective operation of a district governing board. (MPC REC. #57)

75. That the Board of Governors develop and submit to the Governor an Affirmative Action Position Paper concerning its own membership; such a position paper should represent the Board's best judgment concerning the role of statewide representation of minorities, women, and the disabled, and aim to encourage the Governor to model the goals we ask of every district.

District Governing Boards

We understand that the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education is continuing its review of local "district organization and management," as a part of their ongoing review of the Master Plan. Therefore, we deem it inappropriate to comment on this area until such time as the Commission submits its proposals to the Legislature.

With regard to District Boards themselves, the Commission has recommended that elections for members of Community College district governing boards be held in November of even-numbered years. While we appreciate the impulse behind this recommendation--namely, that voter turnout is quite low on other election dates--we feel the recommendation is an unnecessary infringement on local prerogatives. The Commission has further recommended, and we affirm:

76. That the Board of Governors, in cooperation with the districts and other interested agencies, prepare and administer a systematic training program for district governing board members that covers district financial management, academic policymaking, collective bargaining, statewide standards, and other matters essential to the effective operation of a district governing board.

Campus Governance

Whatever the formal relationships between the Board of Governors and the Local Districts, it is on the campuses that the daily decisions are made concerning programs and courses of study. We agree with the Master Plan Commission that the critical issue here is the assumption of authority by the Academic Senate over matters of curricular design and program development, the determination of local academic standards, and other academic matters. We do not agree that the hiring and evaluation of faculty is necessarily a task of the Academic Senate per se, even though it is properly a task of the faculty. With that caveat, we affirm:

77. That the Board of Governors should develop guidelines by which the role of the Academic Senate will be strengthened with regard to the determination and administration of academic standards, course approval and curricula, and other academic matters.

Further, we agree with the Master Plan Commission:

78. That the Board of Governors, working with district and student representatives, develop a plan for encouraging greater student participation in appropriate aspects of campus and district administration (MPC REC. #59)

VI. COMMUNITY COLLEGE FINANCE

Any successful reform of Community College finance must be rooted in a critique of the current statewide funding system. Quite aside from the instability afforded by the successive changes in funding during the past eight years, the current system has major defects. The current mechanism bases state apportionment solely on classroom contact hours (ADA, or average daily attendance); this builds into the system the incentive to emphasize enrollments exclusively. The effects have included the programming of many low-cost programs, often taught by part-time instructors, to finance other programs, and the neglect of non-enrollment generating services like counseling. The most crucial difficulty with the ADA system is that it provides average revenues per credit ADA regardless of the mode of instruction, class size, status of faculty, or the provision of all other support services without which instruction can hardly continue.

In sum, the ADA mechanism bears almost no relationship to the actual cost of the real and different instructional and support services provided by the colleges. It rewards numbers; it contains no incentive for substantive success or performance; it may harm success by forcing districts to cut costs in programs which are "expensive" because they require technology or small classes.

Further, the finance system contains annual cost adjustments which bear no relationship whatever to the actual cost of providing services. The current statutory COLA consists of the ratio of the Implicit Price Deflator for State and Local Government Purchases of Goods and Services for the United States, of the fourth calendar quarter of the latest available year to the fourth calendar quarter of the prior year. This means that the largest amount of annual dollar increase for the Community Colleges is based on past changes in state and local government purchases of goods and services most of which have no relationship to higher education. One effect of this is the proliferation of categorical programs, since the general apportionment mechanism is so highly aggregated and far removed from actual costs.

What funding mechanism would remedy these defects, provide funding adequate to meet the needs of the colleges, and thus satisfy the goals of the state? We agree with the Master Plan Commission that a "Differential Funding" system would be a substantial improvement over the current system. Accordingly, it is our intent:

79. That the Board of Governors direct the Office of the Chancellor to develop and submit to the Legislature and the Governor a system of "Differential Funding" for determining the allocation of state general apportionment to the California Community Colleges. Such a system should include the following categories: instruction, student services, academic support, institutional support (administration), plant operations and maintenance, and other categories as deemed necessary. The Board of Governors' proposal shall be submitted no later than November 1, 1986.

80. That within the "Instructional" category, the ADA measurement of classroom contact hours be replaced by the FTE (full-time equivalent) measurement of credits generated by the instructional activity.

81. That in the "Instructional" category there be subcategories based upon mode and cost of instruction; sub-categories would include, but not be limited to, lecture, seminar, lecture-laboratory, high cost, low-cost independent study, apprenticeship. In addition, to these subcategories, there should be two adjustments: (a) FTE taught by full-time instructors will generate a higher rate than FTE taught by part-time instructors; and (b) FTE in districts below a certain size will generate a higher rate to recognize their lack of economies of scale.

82. That funding for student services be provided not simply on a linear headcount basis, but on two sets of differentials. First, on the basis of services required at different general levels of enrollment (e.g., between 2,500 FTE and 3,000 FTE), thus establishing a buffer for sudden shifts in enrollment. Second, on the basis of differential student need, according to an index to be developed by the Chancellor's Office (e.g., percentage of students on financial aid, ethnic and linguistic minority enrollment, EOPS enrollment, etc.).

83. That Plant Operations and Maintenance formulate be based on an independent assessment of current costs of adequate maintenance of facilities, and not based on historic expenditures per square foot (a figure currently artificially deflated due to retrenchment cuts).

84. That Institutional Support funding be determined on a base-period FTE basis, and adjusted only when FTE changed 15 percent up or down at the college level, thus insuring some stability in administrative ranks.

85. That the implementation of the differential funding system begin in the 1987-88 budget year, and that implementation begin with a calculation of each local district's budget according to the new formulae. In those cases where the new total funding is greater

than funding would be under the current method, the district would receive the new amount. In those cases where the new amount is less than they would have received under the current formula, the difference shall be granted to them on a one-time basis in order to protect continuity of program.

86. That the current statutory COLA based on the price deflator be repealed, on condition that the Board of Governors develop, and the Legislature approve, a new formula based on faculty salary projections and estimates of inflation on the costs of non-salary items.

87. That the Board of Governors convene a broad-based task force which shall include, but not be limited to, representatives of the Chancellor's Office, the Department of Finance, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the Legislative Analyst, Community College Faculty, students, local business and community organizations, to study and make recommendations concerning "performance-based funding" indices. The purpose of such study and proposals is to create an incentive system within the funding mechanism which would reward colleges for excellence, by means of a funding augmentation beyond the base formula. The indices for excellence shall include, but not be limited to, the following: transfer rates to other academic or vocational institutions, retention rates in programs and courses of study, recruitment, retention, transfer and placement by ethnicity and gender, vocational placement rates, skill-level assessment at exit of course and program, student satisfaction rates as measured by periodic student attitude surveys, articulation agreements with both high schools and other colleges and universities, provision of adequate student services according to Chancellor's Office index of need. Such proposals are to be delivered to the Legislature no later than January 1, 1988.

88. That upon the receipt and approval by the Legislature of the Board of Governor's proposal for a performance-based funding system, the Legislature shall create a Special Performance Fund from which local districts shall be eligible to draw special unrestricted augmentations between 1 and 4 percent of their annual operating budgets. In the interim, we expect that the Master Plan Commission will study--and offer its recommendations--concerning a similar funding mechanism for both the University of California and the California State University.

89. That the Board of Governors, with the assistance of an advisory committee made up of representatives of Community College districts, county superintendents of schools, county treasurers, county auditors, and other interested county agencies, review current statutes regarding fiscal services provided Community College districts by county superintendents of schools to determine

which functions might more appropriately be carried out by the Board of Governors or the districts and propose legislation to accomplish the transfer of these functions. (MPC REC. #65)

It must be clear that the Legislature intends an explicit linkage between the assessment of students and the assessment of institutions. We aim to create and fully fund a finance mechanism which will provide incentives for districts to provide programs of excellence for students. Assessment thus serves two functions. At entry, assessment serves to identify individual needs and abilities. At exit, assessment serves to identify the success of the schools in substantially increasing the students' capacities and options. Thus, the linkage between access and success is made tangible and real for both the student and the college.

VII. STAFF CONCLUSIONS CONCERNING COST AND RELATED MATTERS

The Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education has made a set of cost estimates for their proposals. We are not prepared to offer judgment on each of their estimates. We are prepared, however, to offer the following observations concerning the linkage between costs:

As indicated in the Executive Summary, this proposal is animated by two general themes:

1. That in the next eight years, the State will essentially "refinance" the California Community Colleges on the basis of a set of educational criteria. This is a task of historic importance, and provide the basis upon which the colleges will enter the next century. This involves the following elements:

   —An assessment/counseling system with adequate resources and staff.
   —A strengthened and renewed full-time faculty.
   —A decreased dependence upon casual part-time labor.
   —The creation of a cadre of contracted part-time faculty, progressively integrated with college programs.
   —A talented professional student services staff.
   —Committed local administrators and district officials.
   —A fully staffed and funded State Chancellor's Office.
   —A sophisticated differential funding system, funding real costs for programs whose effectiveness is constantly reviewed.

If these elements are in process by 1995, when the demographic bulge in student numbers and need is expected to be most severe, then the state will be capable of meeting its broad needs as defined earlier. If these elements are not in place, the ability of the colleges to provide quality programs is doubtful.

2. That in the next eight years, the State will move increasingly towards a performance model of assessment and finance. In a variety of ways the state will insist upon programs which meet the real and individual needs of students, and thus reward institutions who are judged on real outcomes. This will be a fundamental move in educational perspectives: in which the aggregate data upon which institutions are judged derive from the actual progress made by individual students.

It is necessary to understand the linkage between the elements of this program—and their costs. The colleges cannot do the assessment and counseling mandated by the Legislature unless sufficient funding is provided for a superior assessment and counseling infrastructure, including adequate and talented staff, release time for faculty involvement and development, and increased resources and personnel at the Office of the State Chancellor. Similarly, counseling and placement has little meaning if the colleges continue to be funded on the current basis—because the quality and diversity of programs will surely decline unless funding is based on real costs. Finally, none of it will mean much unless faculty are invited to take responsibility, and compensated well.

So, the conceptual link between elements of this renewal process is this:

- o Matriculation requires
- o Faculty and Staff development and depends on
- o Faculty Renewal and
- o Strengthened Full-time Faculty, along with
- o Decreased Reliance on Part-time Faculty and
- o All of it driven by Differential and Performance Funding

The costs of these various elements will be substantial; yet they will not come all at once and will be "amoritized" across the full passage of the reform process. There is a necessary fiscal "symmetry" here: adequate start-up costs will precipitate real programs which will demand full and effective staffing. Excellent programs will generate results—in social productivity, decreased social expenditures, industrial and social health. Leave us confess our inability to make precise fiscal translations about what we know to be true: that the tangible "benefits" are built through the intangible personal transformations that any good teacher recognizes in the eyes of a student.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges AUG 2 9 1986